

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 123

SP 026 914

TITLE Clinical Experiences in Teacher Education Prior to Student Teaching at Southeast Missouri State University. Report of the Task Force on Alternatives for Clinical Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education.

INSTITUTION Southeast Missouri State Univ., Cape Girardeau.

PUB DATE Dec 84

NOTE 40p.

PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Evaluation; Resource Allocation

IDENTIFIERS *Southeast Missouri State University

ABSTRACT

A study was made of the clinical experiences, offered by Southeast Missouri State University, for students preparing to be teachers. The study was conducted to determine if modifications in the current system would make possible reallocation of resources, while at the same time preserving the quality of clinical experiences for the students. The Task Force on Alternatives for Clinical Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Preparation, appointed by the president of the university, met for eight sessions with the goals of: (1) becoming familiar with state teacher certification requirements and approaches; (2) reviewing and analyzing curricular patterns used in both state and out-of-state institutions; (3) gaining insights from current literature and recognized educational leaders; (4) recommending alternatives for clinical education; and (5) suggesting implications for the teacher education program that extend beyond their immediate charge. The findings, recommendations, and implications developed by the Task Force are presented. (CB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED265123

SP1 006914

CLINICAL EXPERIENCES IN TEACHER EDUCATION
PRIOR TO STUDENT TEACHING AT SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

REPORT
OF
THE TASK FORCE ON ALTERNATIVES FOR
CLINICAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES
IN TEACHER EDUCATION

December, 1984

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Holt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I, Introduction	1
Section II, Establishment of the Task Force	5
Section III, Task Force Activities	8
Section IV, Findings and Recommendations.	9
Section V, Implications	16

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

The institution now known as Southeast Missouri State University was founded by the State of Missouri over a century ago for the express purpose of preparing teachers for the public schools. The institution has grown and matured for over one hundred years to its present status as a regional state university providing a broad range of programs designed primarily to serve the southeast region of the State. Within this broad range of programs Teacher Education has been and continues to be a primary focus. The University is committed to Teacher Education as a premier program of the institution.

History of Clinical Experiences at Southeast Missouri State University

For a very long period of time clinical experiences for college students preparing to be teachers were carried out solely in on-campus settings. Observation, participation, and student teaching activities occurred simultaneously in the same setting. Beginning about 1962 some student teaching experiences were moved from the University campus to area schools. By the early 1970s most of the University's 800-900 student teachers were placed in area schools throughout the entire twenty-six county service region of the University. Approximately 70 student teachers each year were placed in the laboratory school on the University campus.

In the mid 1970s in a major thrust to improve the preparation of teachers at the institution, a decision was made to move all student

teaching experiences into schools in the region. The rationale for this decision was to enhance the clinical experiences in the University campus setting for college students prior to student teaching.

Current Need for Clinical Experiences Prior to Student Teaching

Recent revisions in teacher certification in the State of Missouri mandate two semester hours of early clinical experiences at both the elementary and secondary levels. This early experience requirement originated with a group of public school classroom teachers who believed there was a necessity for such experiences for college students preparing to become teachers.

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has for many years required laboratory and clinical experiences in conjunction with classes in teaching and learning theory i.e. "technique classes."

The new requirement by the State of Missouri to provide early clinical experiences has created a substantial new demand for additional appropriate classroom settings. This is one of the greatest challenges facing institutions of higher education that are engaged in the preparation of teachers.

Current Provisions for Clinical Experiences Prior to Student Teaching

At Southeast Missouri State University a course titled "Introduction to Teaching" (ED250) was developed to satisfy the two-hour state requirement for early clinical experiences. The ED250 course requires students to participate in three, sixteen-hour experiences (two in their major interest area and one in another area.) Two out of three placements are in the

University School with the third being in the Cape Girardeau or area public schools. The purpose of the course is to allow students to observe and participate in the everyday activities of the classroom and to obtain some early hands-on experiences to serve as background for later technique courses. The experiences in the course also allow students to determine if teaching is really the profession they wish to enter. These early clinical experiences will be referred to in this Report as **Level One** experiences.

All technique courses at the elementary level and most at the secondary level provide further clinical experiences for college students. These experiences meet the NCATE Standard to combine teaching with learning theory. These experiences will be referred to in this Report as **Level Two** experiences.

Finally, student teaching experiences are provided in off-campus settings only. Student teaching will be referred to in this Report as **Level Three** experiences.

Recent Historical Developments

Intermittently over the past twenty years there have been suggestions and proposals from various sources (national, state, local) that clinical experiences for college students preparing to be teachers would be enhanced by involving public schools more fully in the process. "Partnership" and "Collaboration" were key words in many of the proposals. Some suggestions were advanced to separate clinical experiences from institutions of higher education and make them the responsibility of K-12 schools and the practitioners in those schools. Many higher education institutions with a long history

of on-campus clinical experiences moved all of those experiences to off-campus settings. Most, if not all, of these changes were brought about by financial pressures as much as by enhancement of the clinical experience component of the teacher education program.

Recent Institutional Developments

At Southeast Missouri State University similar suggestions and financial pressures have intermittently emerged. In the spring of 1984 the financial pressures intensified. In a year of relatively high availability of financial resources, many important needs of the institution could not be funded. One suggested avenue for reallocating resources was a half million dollars allocated to providing on the University campus opportunities for college students to have clinical experiences prior to student teaching.

The question of reallocating some or all of these resources was considered by the Expanded President's Council. That body recommended to the President that a study be made of the clinical experiences on the University campus for college students preparing to be teachers. The purpose of the study would be to determine if modifications in the current system would make possible reallocation of resources, while at the same time preserving the quality of clinical experiences for college students preparing to be teachers.

SECTION II

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TASK FORCE

In July, 1984, the President appointed a Task Force on Alternatives for Clinical Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Preparation. The Task Force was asked to focus on the clinical experiences provided for teacher candidates. The President emphasized that the responsibility of the Task Force was to recommend alternatives which would provide the best opportunities for quality teacher education.

Task Force Charge

Specifically, the Task Force was asked to:

1. Become familiar with state teacher certification requirements and approaches utilized for meeting these standards.
2. Review and analyze curricular patterns used in institutions in the state, out-of-state regional universities, and selected institutions of national recognition.
3. Gain insights from the current literature and recognized educational leaders regarding new directions and national trends.
4. Recommend alternatives for the clinical education aspect of the teacher education program.
5. Suggest implications for the teacher education program that extend beyond the immediate charge of the Task Force.

The Task Force was asked to develop alternatives which would best meet the stated goals. A final report was requested by December, 1984.

Task Force Membership

The membership of the Task Force represented a broad spectrum of the education community both in the region served by the University and on the campus.

Named as members of the Task Force were:

Dorothy Allen, Professor and Chairperson, Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, SEMO

Eleanor Becking, Elementary Teacher, Bernie R-XIII, Stoddard County, Missouri

Peter Bergerson, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science; Chairperson, Academic Affairs Committee, Faculty Senate, 1984-85, SEMO

Lenore Bierbaum, Professor, Department of Teacher Education, SEMO

Delmar Cobble, Past President and Current Member, Missouri State Board of Education, Jackson

Robert Cruse, Secondary Teacher, Art, Hazelwood R-I, Saint Louis County

Alberta Dougan, Assistant Professor, Department of Clinical Education, SEMO

Betty Henson, Elementary Principal, Poplar Bluff R-I, Butler County, Missouri

Grace Hoover, Associate Professor and Chairperson, Department of Home Economics, SEMO

Russell Johnson, Professor, Department of Teacher Education, SEMO

Robert Sheets, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics; Chairperson, Academic Affairs Committee, Faculty Senate, 1983-84, SEMO

Shelton Smith, Superintendent, Dunklin R-V, Jefferson County, Missouri

Milford O. Holt, Dean, College of Education and Behavioral
Science; Chairperson of the Task Force, SEMO

Margaret Theobald, Staff Intern for the Task Force, SEMO

SECTION III

TASK FORCE ACTIVITIES

The Task Force met for eight sessions during the period from September through December, 1984. During the thirty (30) hours of formal meetings information was provided to the Task Force by outside consultants and by teacher educators on the faculty of the University.

Additional information for study was provided through written material relative to State requirements, NCATE requirements, and current practices at the University. An annotated bibliography of current literature was also made available.

At the session in early November, the Task Force focused its activity on identifying variables and alternatives for clinical experiences for college students prior to student teaching. A list of twenty statements emerged from this effort. Some were relatively comprehensive, while others were more specific. A small work group was established to develop a draft of the Report for consideration by the full Task Force.

The work group met several times during the ensuing two-week period. Draft materials prepared by that group were sent to Task Force members.

The Task Force met again in late November. At that meeting agreement was reached in general on the content of a final draft.

The final meeting of the Task Force was in early December. At that meeting the Report was adopted.

SECTION IV FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS

A number of salient facts emerged from the information compiled by the Task Force. These facts became the initial basis of the final recommendations. Awareness of these facts is important in understanding the Report. They are listed here without priority.

Clinical experiences prior to student teaching are required by the Missouri State Board of Education and NCATE.

A review of the current professional literature indicates documentation for the need of clinical experiences in schools away from the college campus. Yet, there is little scholarly evidence to assess these activities.

Inquiries at the national level resulted in the identification of only two institutions of any size that have a nationally recognized program of clinical experiences prior to student teaching in settings other than the university campus.

Quality clinical experiences prior to student teaching in either on the University campus or in off-campus settings require substantial financial resources.

Technique faculty in the elementary, early childhood and exceptional child program utilize extensively and productively the present on-campus opportunities for clinical experiences prior to student teaching. These same faculty express a view that continuation of on-campus opportunities for clinical experiences prior to student teaching is highly desirable.

Most of the technique faculty representing academic majors for the secondary program utilize productively, (some of them extensively) the present on-campus opportunities for clinical experiences prior to student teaching. There is some divergence of views on the desirability of continuing on-campus opportunities for clinical experiences prior to student teaching, with the majority favoring a continuation.

There are a number of problems associated with either continuing clinical experiences prior to student teaching on the University campus or extending them into area schools. Among those problems associated with continuing on the University campus are:

The number of pupils in a class tends to be smaller than is typical in most area schools.

The number of sections of secondary school classes tends to be fewer than is typical in most area secondary schools.

The variety of teaching styles found in one small school is more limited than the variety of teaching styles available in larger area schools or in a combination of area schools.

The breadth of offerings in the curriculum of a small secondary school is less than in larger area secondary schools.

Funding from the State foundation program for public schools is not available at present.

Monies allocated to public schools to provide instruction and related services for exceptional pupils are not available at present, resulting in a limited number of pupils with exceptionalization.

Among those problems associated with extending clinical experiences prior to student teaching into regional schools are:

Statutory requirements provide that only certificated teachers may instruct or discipline in the public schools of Missouri.

Parental concerns exist relative to college students "teaching" pupils prior to the student teaching experience.

Transportation of college students would be required.

Scheduling large blocks of time both in terms of semesters and in terms of consecutive daily hours would be required.

There would be competition between clinical experiences prior to student teaching and the capstone student teaching experience for classrooms and teachers would exist. Coordinating and providing supervision would be complex.

There are a number of advantages associated with either continuing clinical experiences prior to student teaching on a university campus or extending them into regional schools. Among those advantages associated with continuing on the University campus are:

Clinical experiences may be more easily scheduled for college students.

Transportation of college students is not required.

Level Two experiences are planned and carried out in a setting controlled by the University.

Coordinating and providing supervision is less complex.

Among the advantages associated with extending clinical experiences prior to student teaching into regional schools are:

More typical class sizes would be available.

A greater variety of teaching styles could be observed.

A broader range of curricular offerings is present.

Greater accessibility to settings involving exceptional pupils would exist.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The remainder of this section is the heart of the Report. It represents the best collective professional judgment of the Task Force. It is responsive to the charge given by the President. Each of the alternatives presented offers a framework within which enhanced opportunities for clinical experiences for college students prior to student teaching can be developed.

The Task Force believes there are certain essential concepts which undergird and support the recommendations. It further believes there are certain principles which serve as guidelines in assessing alternatives.

Essential Concepts

- * Excellence in schools is an essential strand in the fabric of society.
- * Excellence in teaching is an essential component of excellent schools.
- * Excellence in clinical experiences is an essential component in programs designed to prepare professionals for schools.

Guiding Principles

- * Clinical experiences prior to student teaching should be an integral component in undergraduate programs of teacher education.
- * Clinical experiences prior to student teaching should afford opportunities for college students in school settings which provide a broad spectrum of pupils, a broad diversity of teaching styles, and a broad range of curricular offerings.
- * Clinical experiences prior to student teaching should afford opportunities for college students in model programs as well as typical programs.
- * Clinical experiences prior to student teaching should be provided primarily with pupils in school settings while some carefully structured simulation activities are also appropriate.

- * Clinical experiences should provide for a progression in a spiraling fashion of increasingly higher level, more complex, and more complete teaching activities. For this Report, three levels of activities have been established. Level One represents early clinical experiences. Level Two represents clinical experiences in conjunction with technique classes. Level Three represents student teaching.
- * Clinical experiences should be thoroughly planned, carefully implemented, well supervised, and impartially evaluated.
- * Clinical experiences planned to move in new directions should be implemented within a time frame which permits quality to emerge and develop.

Based on these essential concepts and guiding principles, the Task Force has identified five alternatives for consideration. Each of the five alternatives represents a change from the present situation.

Alternatives

The Task Force has a divergence of views relative to a priority ranking. Alternatives are presented in no preferential order. Following the presentation of each alternative, the priority rankings of the Task Force are given.

OFF CAMPUS/Pre K-12

Provide all opportunities for both Level One and Level Two experience with pupils in school settings in locations other than the University campus. These school settings should provide a broad spectrum of pupils, a broad diversity of teaching styles, and a broad range of curricular offerings. In addition to these experiences in school settings, carefully structured simulation activities are also appropriate.

This alternative discontinues all present clinical experience on the University campus. In school settings other than the University campus, this alternative continues present Level One and Level Two clinical experiences and expands and improves both Level One and Two experiences.

Priority rankings of the Task Force are as follows:

3 First Place Rankings, 1 Second Place Rankings, 1 Third Place Rankings, 2 Fourth Place Rankings, 6 Fifth Place Rankings.

ON CAMPUS/off campus/Pre K-12

Provide opportunities for both Level One and Level Two experiences with pupils in a school setting on the University campus. This setting should provide a broad spectrum of pupils, a broad diversity of teaching styles, and a broad range of curricular offerings. In addition to those in a school setting on the University campus, opportunities should be provided for Level One experiences with pupils in school settings other than the University campus. In addition to those experiences with pupils in school settings, carefully structured simulation activities are also appropriate.

This alternative expands and improves both Level One and Level Two experiences on the University campus. In school settings other than the University campus, this alternative continues present clinical experiences.

Priority rankings of the Task Force are as follows:

1 First Place Rankings, 2 Second Place Rankings, 0 Third Place Rankings, 5 Fourth Place Rankings, 5 Fifth Place Rankings.

OFF CAMPUS/ON CAMPUS/Pre K-12

Provide opportunities for both Level One and Level Two experiences in school settings both on the University campus and other than the University campus. All settings should provide a broad spectrum of pupils, a broad diversity of teaching styles, and a broad range of curricular offerings. In addition to the experience with pupils in school settings, carefully structured simulation activities are also appropriate.

This alternative expands and improves both Level One and Level Two experiences in school settings both on the University campus and other than the University campus.

Priority rankings of the Task Force are as follows:

6 First Place Rankings, 2 Second Place Rankings, 2 Third Place Rankings, 2 Fourth Place Rankings, 1 Fifth Place Rankings.

ON CAMPUS/off campus pre K-6/OFF CAMPUS/7-12

Provide opportunities for both Level One and Level Two experiences with pre K-6 pupils in a school setting on the University campus. Provide opportunities for Level One experience with pre K-12 pupils and for Level Two experiences with 7-12 pupils in settings other than the University campus which provide a broad spectrum of pupils, a wide diversity

of teaching styles, and a broad range of curricular offerings. In addition to these experiences in school settings, carefully structured simulation activities are also appropriate.

This alternative continues both Level One and Level Two experiences with pre K-6 pupils in a setting on the University campus. In school settings other than the University campus this alternative expands and improves both Level One and Level Two experiences.

Priority rankings of the Task Force are as follows:

0 First Place Rankings, 2 Second Place Rankings, 7 Third Place Rankings, 3 Fourth Place Rankings, 1 Fifth Place Rankings.

ON CAMPUS/off campus pre K-6/OFF CAMPUS/7-12

Provide opportunities for both Level One and Level Two experiences with pre K-6 pupils in a school setting on the University campus. Provide opportunities for Level One experiences with pre K-12 pupils and for Level Two experiences with 7-12 pupils in settings other than the University campus. All settings, both on and other than the University campus should provide a broad spectrum of pupils, a wide diversity of teaching styles, and a broad range of curricular offerings. In addition to these experiences in school settings, carefully structured simulation activities are also appropriate.

This alternative continues and expands both Level One and Level Two experiences with pre K-6 pupils in a setting on the University campus. In school settings other than the University campus this alternative expands and improves Level One experiences with pre K-12 pupils and Level Two experiences with 7-12 pupils.

Priority rankings of the Task Force are as follows:

3 First Place Rankings, 6 Second Place Rankings, 3 Third Place Rankings, 1 Fourth Place Rankings, 0 Fifth Place Rankings.

The recommendation of the Task Force is that all five alternatives should be considered by those bodies responsible for a final decision.

SECTION V
IMPLICATIONS

The fifth charge to the Task Force was to, "suggest implications for the teacher education program that extend beyond the immediate charge of the Task Force." The following statements are in response to that request:

1. A major concern which the University should address is the locus of responsibility for the secondary education program.
2. As clinical experiences prior to student teaching are extended into area schools, the student teaching experience (Level Three of clinical experiences) should be reviewed in this new context.
3. Results of implementing legislation passed by the General Assembly two years ago mandating performance based evaluation of all teachers in the public schools should be incorporated into the teacher education programs of the University.
4. Results (yet to be determined) of implementing legislation passed by the General Assembly eliminating the Life Teaching Certificate should be incorporated into the teacher education programs of the University.
5. Adequate lead time will be necessary for implementing any of the recommended alternatives.
6. Adequate financial resources will be necessary for implementing any of the recommended alternatives.

Appendix A, List of Contributing Professionals

Appendix B, List of Selected Materials Used by the Task Force

Appendix C, NCATE Standard 2.3.3

Appendix D, Excerpt from NCATE Visiting Team Report, 1982

Appendix E, Summary Report

Appendix F, Bibliography

APPENDIX A

LIST OF CONTRIBUTING PROFESSIONALS

R. V. Wilson, Director, Teacher Education and Secondary Education,
Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Lenore Bierbaum, Member, Task Force

Alberta Dougan, Member, Task Force

Dorothy Allen, Member, Task Force

Grace Hoover, Member, Task Force

Sue Varnon, Chairperson, Business Education and Office Administration,
Southeast Missouri State University

Larry Lowrance, Associate Professor, Department of Teacher Education,
Southeast Missouri State University

Richard Francis, Professor, Department of Mathematics,
Southeast Missouri State University

James B. Englehart, Director of Secondary Education, Cape Girardeau 63,
Cape Girardeau, Missouri

Donald J. Chase, Associate Dean, College of Education, Bowling Green State
University, Bowling Green, Ohio

Elmer Clark, Dean Emeritus, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

M. Michele McGrath, Director of Student Services and Records, and Director
of Clinical Experiences, University of Missouri, Saint Louis

Russell Johnson, Member, Task Force

APPENDIX B

LIST OF SELECTED MATERIALS USED BY THE TASK FORCE

Improvement Proposal for a "Collaborative Clinical Compact" to improve the preparation of teachers at both pre- and inservice stages. (A Higher Education Budget Proposal)

NCATE Requirements: Standard 2.3.3 Teaching and Learning Theory With Laboratory and Clinical Experience

Excerpts from 1982 NCATE Visiting Team Report

Missouri Certification Requirements for Clinical Experiences

College of Education, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio
Field and Clinical Experiences
Clinical Labs
Developing Collaborative Agreements
Sample Agreements

University of Missouri, Saint Louis
Clinical Experiences Program
Pre-Clinical Experience Program
Syllabus, ED101
Field Experience Component, Goals and
Objectives of Secondary Field Experiences
(SE213)

A Report: Background Leading to the Implementation of the 3-Phase Model of Clinical Experiences, University of Missouri, Saint Louis

Summary of responses from secondary major department chairpersons and technique teachers to a questionnaire relative to clinical experiences prior to student teaching.

teaching specialty and from allied fields, that is needed by the teacher for perspective and flexibility in teaching.

2.3.2 Humanistic and Behavioral Studies

Many disciplines are important in the preparation of teachers. However, not all disciplines are equally relevant, and their relevance is not always obvious. In the following standard it is assumed that problems concerning the nature and aims of education, the curriculum, the organization and administration of a school system, and the process of teaching and learning can be studied with respect to their historical development and the related philosophical issues. These studies are referred to hereafter as the humanistic studies. The problems of education can also be studied with respect to the findings and methods of psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, and political science. Such studies are referred to as behavioral studies. These humanistic and behavioral studies differ from the usual study of history, philosophy, psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, and political science in that they address themselves to the problems of education. The major purpose of such studies is to provide the student with a set of contexts in which educational problems can be understood and interpreted.

The humanistic and behavioral studies require a familiarity with the parent disciplines on which they are based. This familiarity may be acquired as part of the general studies and/or as part of the content for the teaching specialty.

The standard does not imply that instruction in the humanistic and behavioral studies should be organized or structured in a particular way. Instruction in these studies may be offered in such courses as history and/or philosophy of education, educational sociology, psychology of education or as an integral part of such courses as history, philosophy, psychology, sociology; or as topics in foundation courses, problems in education courses, or in professional block programs; or as independent readings.

Standard: The professional studies component of each curriculum for prospective teachers includes instruction in the humanistic studies and the behavioral studies.

2.3.3 Teaching and Learning Theory with Laboratory and Clinical Experience

As distinguished from the Content for the Teaching Specialty and the Humanistic and Behavioral Studies, there is a body of knowledge about teaching and learning that should be the basis for effective performance. Teachers need to understand the theoretical principles that relate their behavior to student learning. For this reason, the study of teaching and learning theory is

included as part of the professional studies component. However, like the study of other empirical theory, the study of teaching and learning theory requires laboratory experiences through which the student may conceptualize principles and interpret their application to practical problems. Therefore, "general methods" and "special methods" should be taught as the application of teaching and learning theory.

The study of teaching and learning theory provides the prospective teacher with principles of practice, and laboratory exercises which include field experiences early in the student's program of study illuminate and demonstrate these principles. Clinical experience confronts the student with individual cases or problems, the diagnosis and solution of which involve the application of principles and theory. Certain kinds of problems (such as planning, selection of learning resources, motivation, presentation, diagnosis of learning difficulties, individualization of instruction, classroom management, and evaluation) represent recurring types of classroom situations. Clinical teaching involves the student in the diagnosis and "treatment" of such problems under the guidance of an experienced teacher. Because it is now possible to simulate many of these situations or to display a selection of real problems electronically—and because the prospective teacher's efforts can be recorded, viewed, and reviewed—it is now feasible to give much effective clinical experience outside the school classroom.

Standard: The professional studies component of each curriculum includes the systematic study of teaching and learning theory with appropriate laboratory and clinical experience.

2.3.4 Practicum

"Practicum" refers to a period of experience in professional practice during which the student tests and reconstructs the theory which he has evolved and during which he further develops his own teaching style. It provides an opportunity for the student to assume major responsibility for the full range of teaching duties in a real school situation under the guidance of college personnel who are experienced in and have continuing experience with elementary or secondary teaching, and certificated, experienced personnel from the cooperating school. It presupposes the learning experiences included in all other professional studies; it is not a substitute for them. It is a more complete and concrete learning activity than laboratory and clinical experience.

The institution carefully selects the cooperating schools used for practicum and establishes effective working arrangements with these schools.

Practicum in most situations may be called student

APPENDIX D

B. Sources of Evidence

Course syllabi were reviewed and the education and college faculty was interviewed. Also, a class in Educational Foundations was interviewed (Dr. McAllistar plus other faculty as listed elsewhere).

C. Program Strengths

None

D. Program Weaknesses

None

E. The standard has been met.

F. Rationale for the Decision

Three required courses for all education students includes the humanistic and behavioral studies cited in the standard.

2.3.3. Teaching and Learning Theory With Laboratory and Clinical Experience (Elementary)

A. Validating Statements

IR, pp. 45-46, 106-109, 126-130.

Corrections: ED250 (e.g.mp. 107) should be GP250. When final approval of course is granted, it will become ED250. ED205 (p. 108) should also be GP250.

IR has been validated as reported with these corrections.

B. Sources of Evidence

Course syllabi.

Interviews with five members of faculty and administration.

Interviews with Director of Clinical Field Experiences, a Student Teaching Center Co-ordinator, and Director of University Schools.

Interviews with three principals, eight co-operating teachers, and nine student teachers, a group of students who have completed student teaching, and nine students in elementary program.

Weekly Summary Reports of University Student Contact with University Lab School.

C. Program Strengths

a) Extensive, carefully planned pre-student teaching clinical experiences are included in the elementary and early childhood programs.

D. Program Weaknesses

None

E. The standard has been met.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

F. Rationale for the Decision

Course syllabi, interviews, and school records indicate that outstanding clinical experiences permeate the total professional preparation components. The University Schools, Early Childhood Center, and area schools are highly co-operative. The University Schools reported 731 hours of student clinical experience at that location in a four-week period during Spring 1982, and 1938 hours in a four-week period during Fall 1982. Twenty-nine different teacher education courses had sent students for these experiences. In addition to these, additional experiences were occurring in public schools and the Early Childhood Center.

2.3.3. Teaching and Learning Theory With Laboratory and Clinical Experience (Secondary)

A. Validating Statements

IR, pp. 45-46, 144, 148-150, 156-157, 167, 172, 178-179, 189-191, 196, 201, 206-208, 214-217, 223-224, 241-242, 249-250, 260-261, 269-273, 281-283, 291-293. The IR is valid as reported.

B. Sources of Evidence

Course syllabi.

Interviews with 18 members of faculty and administration.

Interviews with 13 students from secondary programs.

Interviews with Director of Clinical Field Experiences, a Student Teaching Center Co-ordinator, and Director of University Schools.

Interviews with three principals, eight co-operating teachers, four student teachers, and nine students in secondary programs.

Weekly Summary Reports of University Student Contact with University Lab School.

C. Program Strengths

None

D. Program Weaknesses

None

E. The standard has been met.

F. Rationale for the Decision

Most programs include systematic clinical experiences in methods and other professional courses. Plans are now made to expand the program to include GP250 (ED250) in all teacher education programs. The University Lab School is highly co-operative and provides excellent experiences to students participating there.

2.3.4. Practicum (Both)

A. Validating Statements

IR, pp. 46-53, 293-294. IR has been validated as reported.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX E

CHAIRPERSON RESPONSES QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: Please check the appropriate response in the space provided to the left of each statement.

CURRENT PRACTICE

Yes	No	
<u>11</u>	<u>4</u>	1. Students seeking the B. S. in Education degree who are majoring in our discipline have clinical experiences in University High School prior to student teaching.
<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>	2. Students seeking the B. S. in Education degree who are majoring in our discipline have clinical experiences in area high schools prior to student teaching.
<u>12</u>	<u>1</u>	3. Students seeking the B. S. in Education degree who are majoring in our discipline have simulated clinical experiences prior to student teaching.

ALTERNATIVE PRACTICE

Yes	No	Undecided	
<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	1. Access to clinical experiences in University High School prior to student teaching is important for B. S. in Education degree students majoring in our discipline.
<u>12</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	2. Access to clinical experiences in area high schools prior to student teaching is important for B. S. in Education degree students majoring in our discipline.
<u>7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>	3. If a choice were to be made between access to clinical experience prior to student teaching only in University High Schools or only in area high schools for B. S. in Education degree students majoring in our discipline, the choice would be only in area high schools.
<u>5</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>1</u>	4. If the only experiences available to B. S. in Education degree students majoring in our discipline prior to student teaching in area high schools, our department would prefer to take responsibility for arranging those experiences.

CHAIRPERSON RESPONSES

Yes No Undecided

9

6

0

5. If the only experiences available to B. S. in Education degree students majoring in our discipline prior to student teaching were in area high schools, our department would prefer to have the office of Clinical Field Experiences (Dr. Mabrey) take responsibility for arranging these experiences.

2

11

2

6. If the only experiences available to B. S. in Education degree students majoring in our discipline prior to student teaching were in area high schools, our department would prefer to provide these experiences through simulated situations rather than arrange for them in area high schools.

COMMENTS:

TECHNIQUES TEACHER RESPONSES QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: Please check the appropriate response in the space provided to the left of each statement.

CURRENT PRACTICE

Yes	No	
<u>12</u>	<u>1</u>	1. Students seeking the B. S. in Education degree who are majoring in our discipline have clinical experiences in University High School prior to student teaching.
<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	2. Students seeking the B. S. in Education degree who are majoring in our discipline have clinical experiences in area high schools prior to student teaching.
<u>12</u>	<u>1</u>	3. Students seeking the B. S. in Education degree who are majoring in our discipline have simulated clinical experiences prior to student teaching.

ALTERNATIVE PRACTICE

Yes	No	Undecided	
<u>10</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	1. Access to clinical experiences in University High School prior to student teaching is important for B. S. in Education degree students majoring in our discipline.
<u>12</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	2. Access to clinical experiences in area high schools prior to student teaching is important for B. S. in Education degree students majoring in our discipline.
<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>1</u>	3. If a choice were to be made between access to clinical experience prior to student teaching only in University High Schools or only in area high schools for B. S. in Education degree students majoring in our discipline, the choice would be only in area high schools.
<u>8</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	4. If the only experiences available to B. S. in Education degree students majoring in our discipline prior to student teaching in area high schools, our department would prefer to take responsibility for arranging those experiences.

TECHNIQUES TEACHER RESPONSES

Yes No Undecided

4 8 1

5. If the only experiences available to B. S. in Education degree students majoring in our discipline prior to student teaching were in area high schools, our department would prefer to have the office of Clinical Field Experiences (Dr. Mabrey) take responsibility for arranging these experiences.

1 11 2

6. If the only experiences available to B. S. in Education degree students majoring in our discipline prior to student teaching were in area high schools, our department would prefer to provide these experiences through simulated situations rather than arrange for them in area high schools.

COMMENTS:

SUMMARY OF ALL DEPARTMENTS

N=13 with three science departments responding counted as one department

Twelve of thirteen departments currently use University High School for clinical experiences prior to student teaching for their majors.

Five of thirteen departments use area high schools for clinical experiences prior to student teaching for their majors.

Ten of thirteen departments believe access to clinical experiences prior to student teaching are important for their majors.

Seven of thirteen departments would not choose (six departments would choose) area high schools if a choice must be made between University High School and area high schools for clinical experiences prior to student teaching.

Departments (6) having higher numbers of majors on the B. S. in Education for High School Teachers degree.

Business Education
HPER
English

Mathematics
Music (BME)
Social Studies

All six departments currently use the University Schools for pre-student teaching clinical experiences.

Only one department currently uses area high schools for pre-student clinical experiences.

Four of the six departments believe access to clinical experiences prior to student teaching in both the University Schools and area high schools is important for their majors.

Four of the six departments would not choose area high schools if a choice must be made between University High School and area high schools for clinical experiences prior to student teaching.

Departments (6), other than sciences, having a smaller number of majors on the B. S. in Education for High School Teachers degree.

Art
Foreign Language
Home Economics (VHE)

ITE
Psychology
Speech

Five of the six departments currently use the University Schools for pre-student teaching experience.

SUMMARY, continued

Two departments currently use area high schools for pre-student teaching clinical experiences.

Five of the six departments believe access to clinical experiences prior to student teaching in both the University Schools and area high schools is important for their majors.

Three of the six departments would not choose area high schools if a choice must be made between University High School and area high schools for clinical experiences prior to student teaching.

Science Departments

Biology
Chemistry

Earth Science
Physics

There is lack of agreement or lack of awareness (or possibly both) among the three chairpersons who responded about current practices in using the University Schools and/or area high schools. The science techniques teacher indicates both are used.

There is lack of agreement among the chairpersons about the importance of access to pre-student teaching clinical experiences in the University Schools. The techniques teacher believes it is important .

All three chairpersons and the techniques teacher would choose area high schools if a choice must be made between University High School and area high schools for clinical experiences prior to student teaching.

APPENDIX F

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Wiles, Marilyn M. and Jan Branch. "University-Public School Collaboration Models in Teacher Education," Educational Forum. 44:35-43, November, 1979.

Due to several forces, universities and school districts are being urged to collaborate in the education of future teachers. This article addresses both preservice experiences of teacher education students and the inservice of professional teachers already in the field. (Only the implications related to preservice experiences will be addressed here.)

Some of the forces the authors view as central to the press for university-public school collaboration are as follows:

EXPLICIT INFLUENCES:

1. Teacher organizations at all levels are demanding increased field experiences in teacher preparation programs.
2. Mandated state legislation is requiring that teacher preparation programs meet new requirements. (Reference is made to the State of Ohio.)
3. Shrinking job availability for graduates has caused teacher education programs likewise to shrink. University faculty positions are in jeopardy and continued allocation of resources on the same level has come under question.

IMPLICIT INFLUENCES:

1. The field-based component of teacher preparation programs is not as valued as campus-based teaching in many colleges of education.
2. Taxpayers are questioning the duplication of resources and services between the university and the field (personnel, materials, etc.).
3. The lack of available jobs for graduates of pre-service teacher education programs is pushing college of education faculty to develop programs for noncertifiable areas that are allied to education.
4. Supervision of the conventional field experience is seen as unsatisfactory by faculty, students, field personnel, and administration.

5. Assumptions are being made that preservice teacher education students need more direct planned contact with field personnel prior to their formal field experience.
6. Assumptions are being made that the total pre-service teacher education program will improve if university-field relationships are improved.
(p.37)

Although the authors present four distinct collaborative university-public school models, each with its own justifiable assumptions and potential problems, several points can be noted from along all of them.

JUSTIFICATIONS

1. The number of field experience hours has increased, and the more "practical" experience, the better.
2. Creation of both informal and formal linkages between a university and the field are necessary ingredients for improved teacher education programs.
3. It is advantageous for pre-service teachers to be supervised by those after whom they model.

POTENTIAL PROBLEMS

1. The required initial outlay of time necessary for collaboration in program development may be prohibitive.
2. Not all university faculty or field personnel are capable of working collaboratively.
3. What kinds of rewards should and can be offered for participation of those involved.

"If current indicators are correct and collaboration is a necessary ingredient in program design, traditional patterns of university-public school relationships are inadequate. They fail to allow for fundamental reconceptualizations of what teacher education means, who is responsible for it, and where it takes place."

(p.43)

Page, Fred M., Jr. Laboratory Schools: Updated or Outdated. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center. ERIC Document ED213 672, 1981.

The typical response to laboratory schools by administrators is that public schools could provide similar pre-student teaching experiences at a fraction of the cost. Defenders argue that demonstration of innovative methodologies, inservice training and research support the continued existence of lab schools.

The National Association of Laboratory Schools listed 123 existing lab schools in 1980. Forty-seven percent responded to questionnaires sent out to survey existing facets of the lab schools' functions. Results were:

MAJOR ROLE

Research	13.7%
Teacher Education...	35.4%
In-Service	12.6%
Instruction.....	38.3%

INSTRUCTIONAL METHODOLOGIES

Traditional.....	31.2%
Experimental.....	22.2%
Combination (T+E)..	46.6%

TEACHER EDUCATION...(Time)

Clinical "mini-teaching experiences...	28.6%
Observations	24.5%
Student teaching	23.3%
Combination of others.....	23.6%

RESEARCH...(PRODUCTIVITY)

Lab School Faculty	33.4%
College/Univ Faculty	28.6%
Cooperative efforts of both...	20.6%
Student developed	17.4%

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION (METHODS)

Internal training for lab school faculty.....	37.7%
Conferences (local, state, national).....	24.3%
External consulting by lab school faculty to school systems...	20.3%
Other options	17.7%

The author states several items that the future may hold for lab schools and their continued existence.

1. The research role should be expanded.
2. Demonstrating, consulting and publishing should contribute to the stimulation and service to other schools.
3. Improvements should continue in the utilization for teacher education.

The author states that: "Updating of schools will require concentrated efforts in evaluation and improvement of roles."

(p.5)

McLeod, Pierce H. "A New Move Toward Preservice and In-Service Teacher Education." Educational Leadership. 32:322-425, February, 1975.

A cooperative relationship was developed between the public schools and teacher preparation institutions in Macomb County, Michigan, with the purpose being the ongoing improvement of teacher training within the County. The MCTEC (Macomb County Teacher Education Council) was formed with representation from eight teacher preparation institutions, twenty-one Macomb County School Districts and the Macomb County Intermediate School District.

With membership in the MCTEC, school districts and institutions must be willing to be guided by the following principles:

- a. Commitment to increasing the degree of genuinely shared responsibility and authority for developing and implementing teacher training programs.
- b. Commitment to development of teacher training programs with strong field experience emphasis.
- c. Commitment to development of programs which embody a sequential series of field experiences of increasing responsibility which provide:
 1. Genuine learning assistance to children.
 2. A basis for self-screening or increased commitment to the teaching profession by the teacher trainee.
 3. Exposure to a variety of social, cultural, racial, and ethnic factors which affect the teacher-learning situation.
- d. Commitment to genuine reciprocity in sharing mutual resources of facilities, personnel, materials, and time.
- e. Commitment to coordination and facilitation of information and paperwork which foster the principles above.
- f. Commitment to ongoing evaluation and recommendations pertaining to the degree of attainment of the foregoing principles.

(pp.322-23)

To insure the survival of the public school-university partnership survival, the MCTEC will seek the involvement and support of the Michigan Department of Education.

Kelly, Barbara J. and Janet J. Pholeric. "The Prestudent Teaching Project." Health Education. 9:39-40, May/June, 1978

The Division of Physical Education at the University of Delaware wanted to provide students with prestudent teaching experiences in practical situations. Finding appropriate schools for this experience was the most difficult task for two reasons:

1. Students' schedules allowed only a two-hour block of time away from campus. It was difficult finding a school with a compatible schedule.
2. It was difficult finding an "appropriate" health teacher and health teaching situation.

The authors made a few suggestions to others who may be setting up prestudent teaching experiences and finding difficulty locating schools who might participate:

1. Schedule a large block of time for college students to spend in schools.
2. Consider private or parochial teaching situations since they may have greater flexibility in scheduling. (Teachers in these schools may also be eager for university students to participate in their programs.)
3. Identify teachers who are genuinely interested in the professional preparation of teachers.

The specific situation at the University of Delaware was to plan a course that puts theory and method into practice (in this case, the topic was Health). The task of finding "laboratory" situations for students to implement the objectives of the course was difficult, but not impossible.

Illinois Department of Education. A Partnership of Professionals in Preservice Teacher Education. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center ERIC Document ED 117 061, 1975.

An Advisory Council consisting of elementary and secondary teachers, administrators and education professors in Greenville, Illinois, was initiated in 1972 to write in a program that is dedicated to the education and training of preservice teachers at Greenville College.

Among the many changes the Council has made in the teacher training program is that education students begin observing and participating in the public schools as early as their freshman year in college. In certain preservice experiences, certified public school teachers who have recently retired or are teaching on a substitute basis, observe and evaluate college students who are participating in public schools.

Program evaluation, development and participation is continuous with input from the various members of the Council. Positive contributions to the improvement of teacher education is that

1. Preservice teachers are involved earlier and to a greater extent in the public schools.
2. Public school teachers provide more input in preservice education of teachers.
3. Public school and college professionals work together to educate future teachers .
4. College professors are more effective in their methods courses because of working in public school classrooms.
5. Utilizing public school teachers not under contract fulltime anymore, enlarges the teacher education staff at minimal expense.
6. Preservice teachers participate in a program they observe to be operating on a cooperative basis between public school personnel and college professionals from the very beginning of the preservice teacher experience.

(As of the printing of this article, 1975, there was no precedent for this program nor any prepared instruments for use in its evaluation.)

North Adams State College. North Adams State College Teacher Education Program. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center ERIC Document ED 182 267, 1976.

In 1975 the education department and campus school professionals initiated a model of teacher education requiring a collaborative approach to educating pre and inservice teachers. The purpose of the study leading to the model was to determine how North Adams could be more effective in preparing teachers.

Findings and recommendations made to the faculties involved were:

1. An organizational structure should exist that includes college and public school faculty, administrators and teacher association members.
2. A number of school based teaching/learning centers should be developed that can house education department and campus school faculty at least half their time.
3. The campus school should exist as a clinical setting where college faculty prepare for work in school systems and to serve as the center for developing and studying new materials which could be effectively used in school systems.
4. Faculty resources should be reallocated, in part, to inservice education.

A timetable was established for planning and then implementation of the project. It was stated in the report that...

"Teacher education programs cannot effectively operate without a good relationship with public schools, nor can public schools operate as effectively without assistance from college personnel and their programs."
(p.3)

Cost of the project was initially:

Consultant help in developing collaborative skills within the group of educators central to the project.....	\$10,000
Funds for training facilitators (post graduate studies, inservice programs, faculty development, visitation, participation in conferences)	24,000

Training for those who would be workshop leaders and consultants for inservice.....	1,500
Training provisions and stipends for cooperating teachers.....	1,000
Secretarial assistance ($\frac{1}{2}$ time).....	4,000
Administrative Funds	1,800

(These figures were actual from the 1976 report.)

An evaluative study was made of teachers' and student teachers' opinions regarding what their facilitators or supervisors did and what they should do.

"The study lends some slight evidence to the fact that when facilitators are housed on school sites and work in team approaches with students and teachers there seems to be greater involvement on the part of teachers in how pre-service teachers should be prepared, and in improving themselves as professionals."
(p.6)

It was also suggested in the study that teachers do want to participate in more meaningful ways in teacher education programs and want assistance from the college for their own professional growth.